UNITED NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2971
21 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FIRST MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 21 December 1990, at 11 a.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. VORONTSOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61592/A 4356V (E)

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 12.40 p.m.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): Since the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) held its last meeting yesterday under the chairmanship of Ms. Marjatta Rasi, I should like to take this opportunity to extend my deep gratitude to Ms. Rasi for the way she conducted the business of the Committee and for the great efforts she exerted in carrying out her task. Ms. Rasi submitted two reports to me - a major achievement. I should like also to thank the Vice-Chairmen of the Committee, the representatives of Canada and Colombia.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN CYPRUS

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS OPERATION IN CYPRUS (S/21981) and Add.1)

REPORT OF THE SECRETARIAT REVIEW TEAM ON THE UNITED NATIONS PEACE-KEEPING FORCE IN CYPRUS (S/21982)

LETTER DATED 12 DECEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVES OF AUSTRALIA, AUSTRIA, DENMARK, IRELAND AND SWEDEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21996)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them the following documents: S/21981 and Add.1, report of the Secretary-General on the United Nations operation in Cyprus for the period from 1 June 1990 to 30 November 1990; S/21988/Rev.2, which contains the text of a draft resolution prepared in the course of the Council's consultations; and S/21996, which contains the text of a letter dated 12 December 1990 from the Permanent Representatives of Australia, Austria, Denmark, Ireland and Sweden to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

(The President)

The draft resolution before the Council (S/21988/Rev.2) has been agreed upon by the members of the Council and will be submitted by the President.

I would like to point out the following oral amendments to the English text of the draft resolution: In the first line of operative paragraph 1, the phrase "the costs and problems of financing" should be replaced by "the problem of the costs and financing". In the fourth line of the same paragraph, the phrase "in all its aspects" should be inserted immediately after the document reference "(S/21982)". These amendments will naturally be reflected in all the language versions of the draft resolution.

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution as orally amended. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the case.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by a show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 682 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements on the resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): Canada is very pleased indeed that the Security Council has adopted the draft resolution that was before us this morning.

As a member of the Council for the past two years and as a troop contributor to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) for more than 26 years, Canada has been very concerned about the precarious state of UNFICYP's

READEX FICHE

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

financing. UNFICYP remains today the only United Nations peace-keeping operation to be financed from voluntary rather than assessed contributions. Over the years, these voluntary contributions have fallen consistently short of the amount required to reimburse troop contributors for their costs.

The Secretary-General has repeatedly expressed his concern about the unhealthy state of UNFICYP's finances and has called for the use of assessed contributions to meet the costs for which the United Nations is responsible. He has repeated that call in his latest report on the operations of UNFICYP dated 7 December 1990 (S/21981).

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

This position has been endorsed by all UNFICYP troop contributors - most recently in their letters of 12 December 1990 (S/21996) and 21 May 1990 (S/21301) - as well as by the Secretariat Review Team which examined the operations of UNFICYP and which issued its report on 7 December 1990 (S/21982).

All of these documents make it clear that the only way to resolve the financial crisis facing UNFICYP is to replace the system of voluntary contributions by the use of assessed contributions payable by all Member States.

Since joining the Security Council in January 1989 - two short years ago - Canada has worked to correct the financing difficulties facing UNFICYP. We have urged the use of assessed contributions whenever the semi-annual mandate renewal has come before the Council. We have pressed for presidential statements that included references to the financing problems of UNFICYP. In addition, we encouraged the review of UNFICYP's operations to see where costs might be cut without jeopardizing the continuation of its very important work.

We were pleased, therefore, when the Council, on 15 June 1990, issued a presidential statement (S/21361) that acknowledged the "chronic and ever-deepening financial crisis facing UNFICYP". In the six months since that statement we and our fellow-troop-contributors have made every reasonable effort to convince the members of the Security Council that the time has come to address this problem through the use of assessed contributions for the United Nations portion of the costs of UNFICYP.

Letters were sent by our Foreign Ministers to the Foreign Ministers of several States members of the Council. Diplomats presented our arguments in our capitals and in the capitals of all the States members of this Council. Bilateral discussions were held here in New York. All of these efforts culminated in the draft resolution (S/21988) that was circulated to Council members late last week.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

That resolution would have committed this Council to replacing voluntary contributions with assessed contributions for the United Nations portion of the costs of UNFICYP, effective at the next mandate renewal in June 1991. This was the resolution that the original sponsors and all traditional troop contributors wanted this Council to approve.

As you know, Mr. President, we had intended that this draft should be voted upon last week, prior to the renewal of the UNFICYP mandate for a further six months. However, at the request of some Council members - in particular, one of the sponsors of the draft - we agreed to delay consideration of that draft to allow for further negotiations.

Since then we have continued our efforts to convince certain permanent members of this Council - members that have a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security - that the time has come to solve the financial crisis of UNFICYP. We attempted to convince these members that they, as well as other States Members of the United Nations which, for one reason or another, do not contribute troops to peace-keeping operations, were duty-bound to shoulder their fair share of the financing burden.

Regrettably, we were not successful, and the spectre of a veto was hanging over the Council Chamber. In the circumstances, and with a view to advancing the interests of all peace-keeping States, we amended our draft resolution still further (S/21988/Rev.1) so that the Security Council would undertake to examine alternative means of financing UNFICYP in the next six months, but with the understanding that if no alternatives to assessed contributions could be found in that time the Council would agree to finance UNFICYP using assessed contributions from 15 June 1991.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

We should like to thank all members of the Security Council that supported our revised draft resolution. We are pleased that so many Council members saw the logic of our case earlier this week and were prepared to relieve some of the heavy burden that has been borne by UNFICYP troop contributors for more than a quarter of a century.

Unfortunately, some permanent Council members still were not prepared to commit themselves to sharing in the cost of that force, even though they have voted 62 times now - 62 times - to renew the mandate of UNFICYP, believing, as we do, that it continues to play a vital role in keeping the peace in Cyprus and helping to create conditions that will allow the Secretary-General to continue his mission of good offices.

In the negotiations that followed, we made every reasonable effort to meet these concerns, without losing sight of the objective of the resolution - to resolve UNFICYP's financial crisis. The result is the resolution that this Council adopted unanimously this morning.

We regret that this resolution does not in itself solve the problem. It does, however, commit this Council to examining the problem and to reporting on the results of its examination by 1 June 1991, with a view to enacting alternative financing arrangements, which could include the use of assessed contributions, to place the Force on a sound and secure financial basis simultaneously with the next UNFICYP mandate renewal on or before 15 June 1991.

Although Canada's current term on the Security Council expires in 10 days' time, we will continue to follow this matter very closely and to work with the members of this Council - this is a pledge - in the search for alternative financing arrangements for UNFICYP. We will do this not only as a committed member of the United Nations that believes in peace-keeping in general but also as a committed and dedicated member of UNFICYP.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

In closing, let me thank all the members of the Security Council who voted in favour of this resolution today. We and our fellow-troop-contributors look forward to the day, six months hence, when UNFICYP's finances will be on the road to a more healthy state.

This may well be my last intervention as Canada's representative on the Security Council before my delegation walks away into the sunset, having completed its most recent two-year mandate. Speaking personally, as well as on behalf of each and every member of the Canadian delegation, I should like to thank all of my colleagues for their friendship and their collaboration during the last 24 months. It has been a distinct honour and a singular privilege for Canada to participate in the vital work of this re-energized body at this crucial time in its 45-year history.

(spoke in French)

I conclude by wishing you, Mr. President, the Secretary-General, all the other members of the Secretariat and all my colleagues happy holidays and the best of health and every success and happiness in 1991.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words addressed to me.

Mr. TÖRNUDD (Finland): First of all, I should like to thank the representative of Canada for having set out very clearly the background, the history and the meaning of the resolution that has just been adopted by the Council. It is very important, in our view, that the problem with regard to the financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) be widely understood, and the Canadian statement was certainly another contribution in that direction.

(Mr. Törnudd, Finland)

Finland is one of the countries that has contributed military personnel to the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) since its inception. Therefore, in Finland also there is a very strong awareness of the unsatisfactory nature of the present financing arrangement. Hence, we have consistently supported the Secretary-General in his efforts to bring about a change in the present system of financing. We have also co-operated with other troop-contributing countries in order to achieve a change from voluntary to assessed contributions.

We view the resolution just adopted as a first step in the direction of bringing UNFICYP financing into line with the principles that are applied to other peace-keeping operations. We hope that the Security Council has now started an irreversible process leading to a change in June 1991.

Finally, like the preceding speaker, I may also now have made my last statement in the Council, and I should like, on behalf of all the members of my delegation and on my own behalf, to thank all the members of the Council for having had the opportunity to co-operate with them.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): I should like to begin by paying a tribute to the representative of Canada, as the original leading co-sponsor of the draft resolution, for the great efforts he made in carrying this work forward. Together with the representative of Finland, we have worked with him in the last few weeks, but without the efforts he put in we would not even have got so far as we have today. Of course, my delegation too regrets that the Council has not been able to go the whole way today, but we do believe that the resolution we have just adopted is a big step forward, and we welcome the fact that the Council has at last committed itself to finding a solution to the problem of the finances of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP).

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

As other speakers have said and underlined, UNFICYP is unique among the United Nations peace-keeping operations in depending on voluntary contributions to meet the United Nations costs of the operation. I do think it is important to remember that those United Nations costs are relatively small - less than $30 million a year - because a high percentage of the costs of the operation are borne by the troop contributors. But even voluntary contributions have consistently failed to meet that modest sum, and the UNIFCYP account is now in arrears to the tune of $180 million, so the troop contributors bear that burden too.

Now, the total cost of UNIFCYP since 1964 is estimated to have been, cumulatively, around $2 billion - a very large sum indeed - and most of this has been borne by a small handful of troop contributors. That, frankly, is an entirely inequitable situation. The Secretary-General has repeatedly called for UNFICYP's finances to be put onto a sound basis, and he does so again in the report that is before the Council today. After 26 years it is high time that the Council heeded that call, and my delegation will certainly be working very hard to ensure that when we take this matter up again in the first months of next year we can crack this problem once and for all.

It is, finally, important to realize that what we are talking about here is not just a question of UNFICYP, but applies to peace-keeping in general. The Council may soon have before it a proposal for a much larger peace-keeping operation in Western Sahara. Perhaps it may have one for an even larger operation in Cambodia. It simply is not equitable or acceptable to leave undealt with the anomalous and woefully unsatisfactory arrangements for financing UNFICYP. So the time has come, in our view, to move to assessed contributions, and that is the basis on which we shall be negotiating in the review and the reconsideration that have been put in hand by the resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese Government has consistently held that the two communities of Cyprus should seek a political solution to the Cyprus problem through negotiations and has always evaluated positively the role of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP). On this occasion I wish once again to call upon the leaders of the two Cypriot communities to co-operate fully with the Secretary-General in order to solve this long-pending issue at an early date.

With regard to the financing of UNFICYP, although the Chinese delegation sympathizes with UNFICYP in its financial difficulties and with the troop-contributing countries in their plight, we cannot but point out that the decision related to the establishment, composition and financial arrangements for UNFICYP was made in special circumstances at that time, and UNFICYP therefore has its own unique features. If only the modality for the financial arrangements is to be changed, then probably, as a result, questions of reconsidering and changing other aspects of the arrangements as a whole might also be brought up. Because this is a fairly complex issue left over from history, and also because Council members hold greatly divergent views on this issue, the Chinese delegation has always held that an appropriate and comprehensive solution should be reached through full consultations.

We have noted that the amended resolution has emphasized that consultations on this issue will be carried out by members of the Security Council and that the Council will consider and make a final decision on how to introduce the changes. At present there is no need for all parties to undertake any obligations.

The resolution, in our view, reflects China's view - that is, that consultations should continue, without rushing into any decision on changing the financial arrangements. Therefore, the Chinese delegation voted in favour of the

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

resolution. However, I wish to reiterate that the Chinese position on the financial arrangements for UNFICYP has not changed and that China is not committed to any change in the financing of UNFICYP.

Mr. VORONTSOV (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): I have already stated the Soviet Union's position on the financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus in June of this year. In my statement to the Security Council at that time, I emphasized that the question of how to finance the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus could not be considered separately and apart from other fundamental aspects of that United Nations peace-keeping operation.

We must not lose sight of the unique nature and specific features of this United Nations operation, as reflected in Security Council resolution 186 (1964), which established the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus. In my statement in June I also recalled that the Soviet Union had supported the resolution in 1964, in the light of Cyprus's position and given the fact that the adoption of the resolution did not impose any financial obligations on Member States that did not participate in the Force.

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

Of course, we understand the financial difficulties now facing the United Nations Force in Cyprus. The problem of financing peace-keeping operations in general has now become acute for the Organization as a whole. The large States, the major contributors, including the Soviet Union, pay a considerable amount for peace-making processes in various parts of the world, and soon, with the possible start of expensive operations in Western Sahara and Cambodia, those expenditures and costs will grow still higher.

Given those conditions, financing the United Nations peace-keeping operations has become an acute problem, requiring new and possibly different kinds of solutions from the usual ones. Additional possibilities for cutting the costs of such operations could include the rational use of United Nations contingents and full use of local resources.

Accordingly, we held an exchange of views with the sponsors of the draft resolution in order to find a mutually acceptable solution to this very topical problem of the troop-contributing countries. We are grateful to the Permanent Representatives of Canada and the United Kingdom and other sponsors who responded to this search for a generally acceptable approach in a properly responsible manner.

As we understand it, the wording about a comprehensive study of the problem of the costs and financing of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus means that there will be a thorough study of the problem and all aspects of the functioning of the Force and the positions of the parties. We would stress that the resolution in no way prejudges matters, nor will there be automatic application of mandatory financing of the Force.

We would also emphasize that a final, generally acceptable solution to the problem can be found only as a result of the forthcoming consultations.

(Mr. Vorontsov, USSR)

We should also like to emphasize that at the forefront of the Council's attention must be the problem of a settlement in Cyprus. We think that the chronic deadlock in this process must be ended as soon as possible, and that the existing problems should be solved on the basis of well-known United Nations resolutions, taking account of the legitimate interests of the Cypriots.

We shall be following very closely the Secretary-General's good offices mission and the inter-communal dialogue held within that context. We support the tireless efforts of Mr. Perez de Cuellar, including his efforts to get that dialogue on the road to practical results.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): My Government is fully aware of the very real concerns of those countries that do so much to make the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus a continuing success story. The United States fully supports the United Nations Force in Cyprus, and considers it an integral part of the Secretary-General's continuing efforts to facilitate a lasting and just solution to the Cyprus problem.

We have fully acknowledged the problems underlined most recently in the Secretary-General's report (S/21981 and Add.1) of 7 December on the Force. We firmly believe that a solution must be found to the problem of funding shortfalls caused by the failure of more countries to make voluntary donations to the Force. We have actively supported efforts by the Secretary-General to gain increased donations. Unfortunately, his appeals have so far fallen on deaf ears.

As we address the funding problem, we must also review means to reduce operating expenses while retaining the ability of the Peace-keeping Force to perform its mission. In this light, we are studying with interest the report of the Secretariat Review Team which travelled to Cyprus in November this year.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

We welcome the call in this resolution for a study of ways to place the United Nations Force in Cyprus on a sound and secure basis. We look forward to the results of the review called for in this resolution. At the same time, it should be clear that the resolution does not stipulate one way or another how to achieve a sound financial footing for the Peace-keeping Force. We intend to look into all means of financing the Force, but since it is an issue of political delicacy for the United States we shall also need to consult closely with the United States Congress, and we intend to do just that.

The commitment of the United States to the Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus is clear. We fully support all efforts to address the clear financial burdens the troop-contributing countries face.

Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE (France) (interpretation from French): My delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution that has become resolution 682 (1990). However, we should like to make a number of observations on the subject.

France has always lent its support to peace-keeping operations, which it believes to be an extremely valuable instrument, allowing the United Nations to carry out the duties entrusted to it under the Charter in regard to the maintenance of international peace and security.

Far from confining ourselves to lending support purely in terms of principle, France has committed human and financial resources to peace-keeping operations. More than 500 French officers, non-commissioned officers and other ranks have been involved in this operation. Beyond that, we have always shouldered our financial responsibilities with regard to peace-keeping operations and have paid our mandatory contributions in full and on time. We are ready to lend the same

(Mr. Rochereau De La Sabliere, France)

constructive support to similar peace-keeping operations that our Council may decide upon in the future.

As regards the specific case of the United Nations Peace-keeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP), this year we have again made a voluntary contribution to the Force's account.

The objective of peace-keeping operations is to facilitate the settlement of international disputes and conflicts. Therefore, such operations cannot be regarded as a substitute for peace or for the quest for a negotiated political settlement. Consequently, they should always be temporary. When UNFICYP was created, some 26 years ago, it was clear that its mandate was temporary. Experience has taught us, unfortunately, that the Force has been perpetuated, because of political circumstances that we can only deplore, since they have stood in the way of a negotiated settlement of the problem of Cyprus.

We reaffirm our desire to see a speedy political settlement of the problem, and fully support the Secretary-General's efforts in carrying out his good-offices mission with regard to Cyprus.

In this context, while our Council has reaffirmed - on 9 November - its encouragement of the search for a political settlement, we are concerned, as we deal with the financial difficulties facing UNFICYP, to avoid any decision that might strengthen an already too pronounced trend towards institutionalizing the Force and making it permanent. Confirming that trend would send a bad signal to the parties concerned, just when we are calling upon them to display the political will and increased determination to facilitate the search for a mutually acceptable settlement.

(Mr. Rochereau De La Sabliere, France)

At the same time, however, we have an open mind with regard to an in-depth review of the financing for the Force. We believe that it would be useful for such a study to cover also the functioning and organizational aspects of the Force.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There are no further speakers on my list. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on the agenda.

The meeting rose at 1.20 p.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2972
22 December 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SECOND MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Saturday, 22 December 1990, at 4 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. GREEN
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Mr. TÖRNUDD
	France	Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. LOZINSKY
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61598/A 4370V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.25 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

LETTER DATED 7 DECEMBER 1990 FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE TRUSTEESHIP COUNCIL ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/22008)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I call on the representative of Cuba.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to propose that the Security Council, acting once again in accordance with rule 33.3 of its provisional rules of procedure, defer consideration of this question.

As members are all aware, the Council has not had an opportunity to consider in depth the situation that is the subject of our agenda item. Several questions arose in the course of consultations, but we have not considered the draft resolution in depth, and no efforts have been made to carry out negotiations with all members in order to produce a text that could have been supported by all of us.

The Council has before it, inter alia, very specific requests from representatives of the people whose destiny we shall be deciding, in which they ask us not to take a hasty decision.

In a document addressed to the members of the Council and officially distributed to this body, Mr. Lorenzo De Leon Guerrero, the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands, states, inter alia:

> "Since this question of termination is of the utmost importance to the people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, we ask that any final resolution on this matter be delayed. A postponement of any decision

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

would give us the opportunity to present to the members of the Security Council our position on why at this time the Trusteeship Agreement should not be terminated." (S/22034, p. 2)

Moreover, in a letter that has also been distributed to the members of the Council, Mr. Joshua Koshiba, the President of the Senate of Palau states the following:

"We believe that the concerns of Governor Guerrero concerning the colonial status of the Northern Marianas must be resolved prior to the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement." (ibid., p. 4)

My delegation believes that it is perfectly reasonable - I would even say that it is obligatory - before taking a decision that will signify the termination of the Trusteeship Council's mandate over this Territory, and will therefore have an impact on the destiny of these peoples, that we listen to its representatives and that we not act in haste to do what they ask us not to, that is, vote on the draft resolution today.

Therefore, in accordance with rule 33.3 of the provisional rules of procedure, I am officially proposing that the Council adjourn this meeting, and consider this question on Tuesday, 8 January 1991, at 3 p.m.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The representative of Cuba has proposed that the meeting be adjourned until Tuesday, 8 January 1991, in accordance with rule 33.3 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

I call on the representative of the United States of America.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): I should like to address some of the points raised by the representative of Cuba. I, of course, believe that, in accordance with our agreement in the informal meeting yesterday, the Council should proceed to the vote at this time.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

I think that the most persuasive and perhaps the most important point is that, in fact, yesterday the representative of Cuba recommended that we vote yesterday afternoon - almost immediately - to deal with this situation.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

However, this situation has been before the world community for quite some time. The letters we have received from the Marshall Islands, from the Marianas, from Papua New Guinea, and from Vanuatu on behalf of the regional group have urged us to move ahead, recognizing that further delay would affect the possibility of Micronesia and the Marshall Islands continuing to expand their international contacts - something which is of great importance to them.

As we all know, the text of the draft resolution was discussed at great length yesterday in an informal meeting of the Council. No suggestions were made for change, although there were plenty of opportunities to make them. As we know, too, we have all been available all day today to deal with any further questions that might have come up.

My feeling is that the letters to which the representative of Cuba has referred, and which have been before the Council for some days now, have raised issues that have to do with the Compact of Free Association between the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and the United States. Indeed, they grow precisely out of that Compact. A condition of the Compact was, of course, that it would replace the Trusteeship Agreement, which was terminated by the Trusteeship Council in 1986 - an act which we have recognized and which the members of the Trusteeship Council have again referred to this Council in their letter. Therefore the very differences of view that have arisen from the Compact of Free Association are being worked on and, indeed, resolved under the terms of the Compact. Section 902 of the Compact provides for a series of negotiations, which have been carried forward. Those negotiations have already resolved a number of problems raised between the Federal Government and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. At this stage we think it is important for the negotiations to continue.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

This, of course, is not the place to carry on those negotiations. The Security Council has many responsibilities, many great areas of interest - but one of them is not expertise in the question of territory differences. The Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas has chosen conclusively through an action of its own legislature to join the United States. It is now part of the United States since it is a territory of the United States. Its relationship to the United States is therefore clearly covered under Article 2, paragraph 7, of the Charter of the United Nations, and, as a result, I believe that the Security Council should move to accept immediately the original wishes of the people of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas expressed through their legislature and through a plebiscite held under United Nations supervision, in which 79 per cent of the people voted in favour of the Compact. I believe that we should move as well to recognize the clear wishes of 140,000 inhabitants of the Marshalls and the Federated States of Micronesia, who themselves wish to have their status reviewed by the Council and seen to be effectively that of States in free association with the United States, with the capacity to act independently. Action on the part of the Council will further promote their ability to gain recognition and international ties, which they very much desire and which the South Pacific group has told us they support.

For all those reasons, I believe it is time for the Council to act and I strongly recommend that it do so. We shall of course oppose the proposal for further postponement of a vote on this question.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I shall now put to the vote the Cuban motion to adjourn the meeting until 8 January 1991.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Colombia, Cuba

Against: Canada, China, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining: Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 2 in favour, 9 against and 4 abstentions. The motion has therefore not been adopted.

I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of New Zealand in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in conformity with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. O'Brien (New Zealand) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have the following documents before them: S/22008, letter dated 7 December 1990 from the President of the Trusteeship Council addressed to the President of the Security Council; and S/22001, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

(The President)

I should also like to draw the attention of the members of the Council to document S/22007, which contains the text of a letter dated 17 December 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Papua New Guinea to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; to document S/22009, which contains the text of a letter dated 18 December 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Vanuatu to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council; and to document S/22034, which contains the text of a letter dated 21 December 1990 from the Permanent Representative of Cuba to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council.

The first speaker is the representative of New Zealand. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. O'BRIEN (New Zealand): As a member of the group of South Pacific Forum nations represented at the United Nations, New Zealand has already indicated through a letter signed by the Permanent Representative of Vanuatu - to which you just made reference, Sir - its support for the partial termination of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

This is a significant occasion for the Territory and more generally for the Pacific Island region to which New Zealand belongs. Three constituent parts of the Trust Territory indicated some years ago, through exercises of self-determination supervised by the United Nations, their choices for future political status. The purpose of my Government in seeking to address the Council briefly this evening is to reinforce New Zealand's support for the action being taken here today.

Following the exercises of self-determination and a Trusteeship Council resolution in 1986, New Zealand was among the first countries to establish diplomatic links with the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the

(The President)

Marshall Islands. I had the personal honour to serve as New Zealand's first non-resident Ambassador to those two countries. Since that time, links between the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the countries of the Pacific region have flourished, as also have the participation of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas and Palau in various regional organizations.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

In 1987 both the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands were admitted to membership of the South Pacific Forum, in which they have played an active and constructive part. The expansion of the Forum's membership to include two such Central Pacific nations enhances this vital dimension of the organization. The Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands have brought to the Forum an added dimension that derives from their long association with the United States. This experience is a valuable asset.

Today's decision would mark another step by the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands along the path of nation-building. This process is an evolving one in many island countries of the Pacific. Of course, political autonomy cannot be equated with economic autonomy, for in today's world the notion of full economic independence is illusory. No nation State - big, medium, or small - is truly independent in an economic sense. The Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands will, we imagine, continue to depend on co-operation with others to enhance economic well-being.

The Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands take this further step at a time when the Pacific Island region faces challenge, not least in the environmental area. Regional anxiety about the effects of nuclear testing, the harmful effects of the disposal of toxic wastes and the devastation and threat to fishing stocks by driftnet fishing is a paramount example. So, too, is the concern about the effect of global warming on low-lying islands. These are shared concerns that affect us all in the Pacific region. We are determined to co-operate with those outside the region whose interests coincide in these crucial areas.

(Mr. O'Brien, New Zealand)

At the bottom line, the interests and wishes of the people must be kept uppermost in the processes of political self-determination. It is a principle that has guided the United Nations, and countries like New Zealand, in the approach to decolonization over several decades. As the United Nations celebrates the thirtieth anniversary of the Declaration on decolonization, it is fitting that we recall that while some Territories choose full political independence others do not. The Council is today faced with an example of differing choices. On the basis of the express - and expressed - wish of the people of the three island groups concerned, New Zealand endorses the call made by others for the partial termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, and looks forward to the Federated States of Micronesia and the Republic of the Marshall Islands gaining recognition from those Member States that have been awaiting the outcome of Security Council action.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that that is the case.

There being no objection, I put to the vote the draft resolution contained in document S/22001.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

Against: Cuba

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The result of the voting is as follows: 14 in favour and 1 against. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 683 (1990).

(The President)

I shall now call on those members who wish to make statements on the resolution we have just adopted.

Mr. ROCHEREAU DE LA SABLIERE (France) (interpretation from French): Resolution 683 (1990), which we have just adopted, is designed to give effect to the results of the exercise by the peoples of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands of their right to self-determination.

The peoples of those Territories - which until now have been part of the International Trusteeship System, under the authority of the United Nations - approved in referendums monitored by the United Nations agreements defining the new status of each. The Trusteeship Council then decided, by its resolution 2183 (LIII), of 28 May 1986, that the necessary conditions to terminate the trusteeship over the three Territories had been met.

Under the Charter it is for the Security Council to take the final decision. The ending of trusteeship status will make it possible for the Territories concerned fully to implement the status that their respective peoples have freely chosen.

Therefore, my country fully supported the draft resolution the Council has just adopted. It was sponsored by all the members of the Trusteeship Council, of which my country is the current President.

My delegation has noted differences of interpretation between the authorities of the Northern Mariana Islands and the federal authorities of the United States about putting into effect some of the provisions of the agreement defining the Territory's new status. These differences are now the subject of talks between the two parties in the framework of the bilateral consultations provided for in that agreement. We very much hope that those talks will soon lead to results that are satisfactory to both sides.

Mr. YU Mengjia (China) (interpretation from Chinese): Today the members of the Security Council are meeting to review the question of partial termination of the Trusteeship Agreement for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. This has great significance and is a happy occasion for both the Security Council and the people of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. China, as a permanent member of the Security Council and a member of the Trusteeship Council, attaches great importance to today's deliberations in the Security Council.

The Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands is the only strategic Trust Territory of the United Nations. According to provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement, the Administering Authority has the obligation to help the Trust Territory play its part in the maintenance of international peace and security, and to promote the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the inhabitants of the Trust Territory and their development towards self-government or independence.

The termination of the status of strategic Trust Territory falls within the responsibilities of the Security Council. It is the consistent position of China to support the principle of national self-determination and respect the choice of political status by the peoples of Trust Territories. Relevant legal documentation confirms that the peoples of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands, which constitute parts of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, have, in accordance with the provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Trusteeship Agreement, expressed their will and chosen their political status through plebiscites and have exercised their right to self-determination.

(Mr. Yu Mengjia, China)

China respects the aspirations of the peoples of these three entities, supports the termination of their status as Trust Territories and is in favour of the draft resolution recommended by the Trusteeship Council. After the termination of trusteeship the political and economic development in these three entities will enter into a new stage. We wish to extend our heartfelt congratulations to the leaders and peoples of the three entities. May they enjoy prosperity and make their due contribution to the maintenance of international peace and security. China is willing to maintain and develop friendly relations with them.

At present Palau is still under the United Nations Trusteeship System. We hope that the Administering Authority will continue to fulfil its obligations and responsibilities as stipulated in the United Nations Charter and the Trusteeship Agreement, fully respect the aspirations of the people of Palau and actively promote their political, economic and educational advancement so that they may also achieve an early realization of self-determination.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): If we take literally the statement made by Ambassador Pickering before the vote, the situation in which we now find ourselves is really quite confusing. He stated that the Trusteeship Council had already terminated the mandate entrusted to the United States over the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and he referred to the Northern Mariana Islands as an integral part of United States territory and, therefore, governed by the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter. If that is the case, why were we convened here this afternoon, a Saturday, to take a decision that has already been taken by another body and to deal with issues that are supposedly outside the Security Council's lawful purview and related as they purportedly are to the domestic jurisdiction of a sovereign State?

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Of course, that is only one aspect of the extraordinary situation in which the Council finds itself as a result of the resolution it has just adopted. In that connection, I should like first to refer to Article 83 of the Charter, which was in force, to some extent at least, up until a few moments ago, even though I am not really sure what its function is at this point and in the present context. Article 83 reads:

> "All functions of the United Nations relating to strategic areas, including the approval of the terms of the trusteeship agreements and of their alteration or amendment, shall be exercised by the Security Council."
>
> (Article 83, para. 1)

The Security Council has today adopted a resolution that in fact endorses or validates a decision already implemented by the Administering Authority, with, it would seem, the assent of the Trusteeship Council, but without, as far as I am aware, the Security Council's ever having considered any alterations or amendments or any other modifications to the Trusteeship Agreement entered into between the United Nations and the United States of America.

What was called in that agreement the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands has now been parcelled out into several "entities" - to use the term employed in the resolution. Three of them are affected by the resolution adopted today, and a fourth entity - Palau - continues to remain - if we understand the text of the resolution correctly - subject to the terms of the Trusteeship Agreement. Of the three entities affected by the resolution we have just adopted, one has clearly asked us not to take the action we have taken and not to make the decision we have made today. However, in its wisdom, the Council has decided to dismiss that formal request made to it and, for reasons no one has yet been good enough to explain to us, to move to take a speedy vote on this question.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

In our view, the Security Council has not properly shouldered its responsibilities with regard to this question. Just in passing, I should like to make it clear that it is indeed true that yesterday, in informal consultations, I did say that I did not understand why we had to wait until Saturday afternoon to do what I feared we would do, and that the discussion and vote could have taken place yesterday - not because I wanted to speed up the taking of a decision that ignored the requests made by the representatives of the Mariana Islands and Palau, but because I feared what would happen, namely, that the United States would once again receive the Council's blessing.

What I did not understand yesterday and what I still do not understand today is the merit of postponing the exercise until this afternoon, since our action is hardly a surprise to world public opinion, which has grown accustomed to the Council's so-called unanimity. Thus, it was difficult to understand yesterday why we had to meet on a Saturday afternoon to perform a task that would probably have been performed in much the same way on Friday.

Moreover, it is my belief that we have not acted in a manner consistent with the issues at hand. Whatever the authority vested in members of the Security Council or whatever authority members may feel they have, that authority is not, in our opinion, so great that the Council can decide the fates of others without even allowing the representatives of the peoples of the regions concerned an opportunity to explain their reasons for not wanting the Council to take the action it has taken today. The Trusteeship Agreement has been in existence for more than 40 years. The resolution of the Trusteeship Council, as noted in the resolution adopted today, dates back four years, to 28 May 1986. After having waited for 40 years and four years - depending on the point of reference - not to have waited a couple of weeks more in order to allow the Council to afford those who are empowered - although unrecognized by us - and who continue to be empowered to

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

express the views of their peoples an opportunity to be heard is a way of proceeding that is fairly hard to understand. It might indeed be described as inadmissible, particularly in the case of a Security Council which, with a draft resolution actually before it, still managed to come up with adequate reasons for postponing a decision and became bogged down here in lengthy discussions about particular wordings or concepts. While all that was taking place, we were nevertheless still unable to respond in an appropriate manner to very specific formal requests that had been made.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

The Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands, in his communication which I mentioned earlier, also pointed out, and I should like to quote him:

"... we do not support the Trusteeship Council resolution. The time is not ripe for Security Council termination of the Trust for our people. We still desire to have the protection afforded us by the United Nations.

"Failure to maintain the Trusteeship Agreement may cause the United States to absorb further the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands into the Federal Government [of the United States]. It is the official position of our Government that the United States has failed the United Nations and the people of the Northern Mariana Islands in not delivering on its trusteeship commitment. As of this date, the United States of America and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands continue to disagree sharply on key sovereignty questions. These questions directly affect our right to internal self-government." (S/22034, p.2)

The communication from the Governor goes on to state:

"... termination of the Trusteeship Agreement would be premature unless the United Nations means to abandon us. We trust this is not the case." (ibid.)

If this very discreet meeting, with such a small audience, has any echo in the press, perhaps that will be how the Governor will receive the Council's gracious reply to his request, and will perhaps arrive at the bitter conclusion that the Council has indeed decided to abandon him and, furthermore, to abandon fulfilling the very clear obligation the Council had while Article 83 of the Charter was in force.

As I said in respect of the former Pacific Territory, there are three entities covered by the final operative paragraph of this resolution; one of those entities has expressed itself in the very clear terms of its Governor's letter. There are

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

other entities covered by the final operative paragraph of the resolution which would appear to be satisfied with the resolution the Council has just adopted.

However, there have been many indications which had us to think that the situation is not that favourable and that joy is not that widespread in the other parts of the former Territory, or in the other entities, if you prefer to use the new terminology now.

On 6 December 1990 - probably while we members of the Council were getting bogged down in our furious discussions about "would", "should" and "could" for the declaration you issued a few days ago, United States television showed a programme, part of which came from the Marshall Islands, and which showed some things which might perhaps have been of interest to the Council before it took that so important and hasty decision we adopted this afternoon.

One of the commentators, Diane Sawyer, began the programme with the following words:

(spoke in English)

"They lost nearly everything: their culture, their independence, their health; in the 40s and 50s, the United States turned the Marshall Islands into ground zero, and the people became nuclear guinea-pigs."

(spoke in Spanish)

Later in the programme, the commentator Sam Donaldson said the following:

(spoke in English)

"Good evening. We begin tonight with the shocking story of how a big country's occupation of a foreign territory is wrecking the lives of the people who live there, and we are not talking about Iraq or Kuwait, we are talking about the United States and the Marshall Islands; and if you think wrecking the lives of the people puts it too strongly, wait until you see what we discovered.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

"Perhaps you remember hearing of Bikini Atoll: that's where the United States detonated its largest hydrogen bomb. Bikini is part of the Marshall Islands, which, after World War II, became a de facto United States colony. Independence officially came to the Marshalls in 1986, but American domination and abuse didn't end."

(spoke in Spanish)

And, indeed, the programme went on to show interesting views of the territory. It interviewed some officials and some members of the public, and gave testimony of how that Territory, the Marshall Islands archipelago, was first turned into a testing-ground for nuclear devices which had effects on the population which continue up to this day.

According to the programme, almost 10,000 inhabitants of the island are now refugees in one small part, covering 78 acres, considered the most overpopulated place on Earth, where they had to seek refuge because the rest of the territory is not exactly habitable; this is because of the effects of those tests, for which, even today, several decades later, that people is paying the price, the price of having been turned into a firing range for testing nuclear devices. The figure of almost 10,000 inhabitants of the Marshall Islands given by the United States programme is a quarter of the population of the archipelago.

The commentators go on to explain that, as if the dramatic past the islands had suffered were not enough, they were later turned into a site for dumping waste from the continental United States; there was talk, also, of the possibility that this waste also included nuclear wastes.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

The President of the Marshall Islands - who, it is to be supposed, is one of the representatives of one of the entities in what used to be a territory, and is one who does, it would appear, agree with the resolution you have been so kind as to present to him with today - President Amata Kabua, explaining why his country and his people found themselves obliged to negotiate with the United States and accept that things like this were happening, things like designating the Islands as a dump-site for United States garbage, said something which might to some extent sum up the Trusteeship process to which the Islands were subjected and which is culminating so gloriously today.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

President Kabua said:

(spoke in English)

"We lost many things in that Compact. We regret them. But what can you do? I mean, when you grow up with your brother and he is a lot bigger than you and he slaps you, what do you do?"

(continued in Spanish)

Those who believe that the Security Council has really completed an exercise of decolonization or of respect for the will of peoples might better have tried to find out first the past and present thinking of the representatives of the Territories over whose fate we have so blithely and hastily felt obliged to take action.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): My Government has been a member of the Trusteeship Council from the very outset, and we have always played an active part in its work. We also have long-standing ties of friendship with the countries and peoples of the South Pacific. So the vote we have just taken today is a source of great satisfaction to my delegation.

There can be very few areas of the world whose economic and political development and aspirations have been so well monitored, so well charted, as the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands over the years. We believe the Trusteeship Council has always carried out its duties assiduously. It has sent many visiting missions, on a regular basis, to the component parts of the former Trust Territory. So far as my delegation is concerned, we are proud that the Trusteeship Council has been able to promote effectively the free and fair expression of the wishes of the inhabitants of the Territory.

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

I might refer briefly to the resolution adopted by the Trusteeship Council in 1986, in which it said,

> "Having heard the statements by the elected representatives of the Trust Territory Governments requesting early termination of the Trusteeship Agreement, and believing this to reflect the freely expressed wishes of the people of the Trust Territory". (Trusteeship Council resolution 2183 (LIII), seventh preambular paragraph)

Later, in an operative paragraph, the Trusteeship Council

> "Notes that the peoples of the [entities concerned] have freely exercised their right to self-determination in plebiscites observed by the visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council". (para. 1)

In fact, I have in front of me a letter from the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands, dated September 1986, which makes precisely those points.

My delegation therefore welcomes this partial termination of the Trusteeship Agreement. We want to extend our congratulations to the people of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. We wish them every success and all prosperity in the years ahead.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): It is rare for the Security Council to be able to take a seemingly small step that means so much to a group of people. I believe today's action by the Council is such a step. One of the fundamental principles the United Nations seeks to uphold is the right to self-determination. The peoples of the former entities of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands participated in a process that led to true achievement of self-determination for three portions of that Territory. The United Nations was an active promoter and observer of that successful process. The Trusteeship Council

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

sent various missions to monitor plebiscites held in each of the entities. In 1986 the Trusteeship Council concluded that the peoples concerned had achieved self-determination. The action we have taken today gives the endorsement of this Council to the Trusteeship Council action which meant so much to those peoples.

I should like to express my Government's welcome of this endorsement of the will of the peoples involved.

Mr. LOZINSKY (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) (interpretation from Russian): The Security Council has taken a decision on a problem which has remained unresolved for many years now. Fully aware of the complicated historical and legal nature of the question of Micronesia, we note with satisfaction that the Security Council - which under the Charter has the important task of ensuring that United Nations responsibilities with respect to strategic Trust Territories are carried out - has been able to arrive at a mutually acceptable solution based on the right of peoples to freedom of choice and conforming to the procedures set out in the United Nations Charter.

For many years the Trusteeship Council has dealt with questions of the economic, social and political development of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and has submitted the relevant reports to the Security Council. Today we can note with satisfaction that the peoples of the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands have freely exercised their right of self-determination by approving the respective agreements on their new status through plebisites observed by visiting missions of the Trusteeship Council. In addition to those plebiscites and the decisions of the appropriate legal bodies established in the entities, resolutions were adopted approving those status agreements and freely expressing the wish to terminate the status of the entities as part of the Trust Territory.

(Mr. Lozinsky, USSR)

We do not exclude the possibility that the future could bring various new legal, economic and other questions for the peoples of Micronesia. But we are hopeful that those questions will be resolved, taking full account of the interests and the freely expressed will of the Micronesians. We note that the decision taken by the Security Council today was welcomed by the members of the South Pacific Forum, who desired the termination of the Trusteeship Agreement with respect to the three Micronesian entities in question.

In our view, the Security Council's decision on Micronesia will assist the growing tendency to diminish the military presence in the Pacific and Asian regions. In that connection, we note that in the course of the Security Council's consultations assurances were given that the United States did not have the intention of establishing additional military bases in Micronesia.

In today's resolution, the Security Council has expressed the hope that the people of Palau will be able in due course to complete the process of freely exercising their right to self-determination. That would allow the Security Council in due time to decide on a full termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

We are firmly convinced that a final solution to the problem of Micronesia could contribute significantly to improving the situation not only in that region but in international relations in general and that it would promote the establishment of mutually beneficial co-operation among States.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): My delegation voted in favour of the resolution just adopted, in the knowledge that the three entities of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands have, through plebiscites observed by the United Nations, expressed their wishes on how to determine their own future. This warrants the partial termination of the Trusteeship Agreement.

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

We did so based on the confirmation of the members of the Trusteeship Council, which has determined, as is clearly set forth in the operative part of the draft resolution it proposed to the Security Council, that in the Federated States of Micronesia, the Marshall Islands and the Northern Mariana Islands the objectives of the Trusteeship Agreement have been fully attained and that the applicability of the Trusteeship Agreement has terminated, with respect to those entities.

However, as was pointed out in the letter of the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands and by the Permanent Representative of the United States, there are still ongoing negotiations between the United States and the elected representatives of the Northern Mariana Islands fully in order to implement the terms of the Covenant. It is our earnest hope, therefore, that these pending differences will be resolved soon and that the concerns expressed in the letter of the Governor of the Northern Mariana Islands will be effectively addressed in the spirit of the Compact they signed.

My delegation also shares the view of the representative of Palau and the members of the South Pacific Forum, as expressed in their letter, that the people of the fourth entity of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, Palau, will in the not too distant future be able freely to exercise the right to self-determination.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There are no further names on the list of speakers. The Security Council has thus concluded its business for this meeting.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.